

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Attendance: Jan Sassaman, Linda Bowerman, Al Vickers, Doug Guild, Jim Ward, Steve Yuhasz and BJ Tipton

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Blair Pollock, Paul Spire, Cody Marshall and Wanda McCain

Audience: Bonnie Hauser

1. **Opening and Welcome** Sassaman states that this is a momentous occasion because on paper there are now eight voting members of the SWAB. Chapel Hill now has a legal person other than me.
2. **Adoption of Minutes from August 7 SWAB meeting** Guild moves to accept. Vickers 2<sup>nd</sup>. Passes unanimously.
3. **Recycling of Lights Containing Mercury/Recycling of Residential Cooking Oil**  
Wilson states that the SWAB passed two resolutions at the last meeting. One had to do with recommending the implementation of lights containing mercury and residential cooking oil recycling. Those are going to the commissioners this week. Under each of those two programs Rob Taylor the previous Recycling Programs Manger, who recently left, had prepared a memorandum explaining how each would work and the cost. At the last meeting regrettably we had to throw a little cold water on it given the budgetary situation the County is facing and the resulting position freezes. Losing such a critical staff person as the Recycling Programs Manager has impeded our ability to administer and manage programs. Even a free program takes planning, logistics, and coordination. In facing even more uncertain staffing situations through the budget process, I had to recommend in a memorandum to the BOCC against implementing these programs at this time.

Ward asks what it would take to be able to implement this. What do you lack?

Wilson states that what is lacking is the loss of the division leader, the Recycling Programs Manager. There is the recycling programs supervisor, Cody Marshall who is currently doing two jobs. What is needed is some experienced person that can with minimal guidance, direction or involvement from anybody else to do the necessary work to put this together. For instance with lights containing mercury, they are currently accepted at the HHW program and can be done cheaper by switching to another company, but more volume is needed to do that. The proposal was to originally start accepting those at the Eubanks and Walnut Grove convenience centers to create enough quantity to move them from the current vendor that we pay to another vendor that we would pay less. Coordinating that transition, establishing the relationship and the contract with the new company, training the attendants, advising people on those types of lights that qualify, establishing a protocol for packaging

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

them, setting a schedule for collection and reassembly back at a single point, and maintaining records of quantities are the things needed to run the program. It sounds fairly simple and requires a person week altogether but now that time isn't available. It would be similar logistics with the cooking oil.

Guild asks if you would be paying for the cooking oil.

Wilson replies no but we are now. That is another transitional arrangement that would have to be made.

Sassaman asks how much would be saved on an annual basis in sheer cost, not including the person for both cooking oil and lights.

Marshall states that lights currently are \$0.60/lb which would become \$0.12/lb. We would have budgeted \$6,000 to get rid of lights with the current system. For the next fiscal year we would be have budgeted \$3,000 for the lights.

Wilson states that there would be a \$3,000 savings, but that is based on three times the quantity.

Marshall states that for the cooking oil we don't do a lot of cooking oil at HHW but still pay \$0 .60/lb for it now. If we went with a separate company like Piedmont Biofuels they would pick it up for free.

Vickers asks what is the current volume.

Marshall replies it is not a lot, but there is a demand for it. We would track tonnage but not have invoices any longer.

Sassaman states that so what we are talking about is the need to be able to spread out the collection locations.

Wilson concurs. And to make it more accessible to people and available at different hours.

Guild asks if we are doing automobile wastes at all the centers.

Wilson says yes but we want to try these new programs at only the two biggest sites.

Yuhasz asks how much would you have to increase the volume of the mercury containing lights in order to go from the 60 cents to the 12 cents.

Marshall replies I don't know that number off hand.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Ward states that it is surprising that there isn't enough of demand for cooking oil that it is no longer something you have to pay for.

Wilson states that there is a demand if there is some quantity. We have just enough to be a problem but not enough to have picked up [free].

Guild states that there is a biodiesel coop in Burlington that might be interested.

Bowerman asks if the school is still buying biodiesel. They are just down the road.

Wilson states that once it's collected in a large quantity there wouldn't be a problem of getting rid of it.

Spire states that EcoFlo is willing to set aside the lights containing mercury but the more we request EcoFlo to do and take their profit away from them they will only go so far and then say 'If you're going to take the products and make a profit, then we'll only go so far". It comes back to the manager managing that program in house to make the programs work.

Wilson states that it is not only that I don't know if I will lose other recycling staff or other programs are cut. The person intended to go around and collect the lights is the person who collects our electronics. I don't know if six months from now if there will be an electronics program. As far as I know everything is on the line. I am in no position to take on additional work.

Tipton states that what I'm trying to figure out is probably pure politics. How does what the County management wants and does and prescribes compare to what we are doing?

Sassaman states that what you are asking is it seems that the County manger is on a different track than we are.

Vickers states that my impression has been from talking to County employees is the County manager is on track to cut costs at all costs and he is going to make the painful decisions to do it.

Tipton asks why are we sitting here if his vision is different. We could talk about what programs it would be nice to have but it is unclear now what is happening. It seems that I'm hearing that you have your hands tied and at the same time I'm hearing how can the cooking oil be collected.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Wilson states that there is a significant amount of uncertainty. I can't speak on the political uncertainty but I can speak on the staff uncertainty. I don't think that any other department is taking on or seeking new activities or services at this point. The direction from the manager is quite clearly in the opposite direction. I am following his clear guidance.

Sassaman states that BJ you kind of anticipated what I wanted to say under #4. I am really alarmed when I hear talk about cutting back on recycling as a cost cutting mechanism. I can understand cutting back on those things coming out of the general [fund] budget if the County manager and the Commissioners need to do so to try to balance the budget without doubling the property taxes. My understanding is a large part of the recycling comes out of the 3-R Fee and that is why we put the 3-R Fee in place. That [recycling] is already paid for and will be paid for next year and I don't see that coming down.

Wilson clarifies that it covers the full cost now.

Yuhasz asks dose it cover the cost to keep the convenience centers open to take on the recycling.

Wilson replies it does not cover the cost of convenience center operation. It covers the cost of recycling services and collections that are provided to the recycling centers. It does cover the unstaffed drop-off sites 100%. We may talk Monday about covering some of the convenience centers operations.

Ward asks to repeat what it doesn't cover.

Wilson states that the only recycling service that it doesn't cover is that it doesn't pay for solid waste convenience centers site operations and maintenance. What I mean by that is it doesn't contribute to rent for the sites that are leased, the phone or electric bills at those sites, or the attendants' salary. It does contribute to sending trucks and drivers out to service the containers that are there. When the Walnut Grove property was purchased it did cover half of the cost of that.

Sassaman states that my position still stands that if we cut back on the recycling programs we are taking programs away and yet unless the 3-R Fee is reduced we are still charging citizens for those programs. We went through a number of years ago the issue of State law requiring a correspondence between those things that you charge people for and the services you provide. Cutting is a different issue from not adding programs.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

When I pay a fee for something I expect to get the service that I pay for. I expect it from my plumber and my clients expect it from me and I expect it from my government.

Yuhasz states that I don't think that there will be support for cutting the recycling existing programs. What has to be made clear is what the interplay between the county's contribution out of the general fund to the overall solid waste program and how that interfaces with the recycling program and the 3-R Fee. I'm not sure that that is always clear. I'm not sure that it is clear within the budget presentation. That is where we need to make sure that we separate the recycling program and that portion of the budget from the rest of the convenience centers and whatever other sanitation programs are supported through the County's general fund. Part of that is how the budget is presented by the Department and the other part is for the Commissioners to remember there are separate issues here. That is something that I will try to remember that we take a look at when looking at the budget.

Sassaman states that it is one thing to look at one fewer convenience center or one fewer unmanned drop-off site.

Yuhasz states that there has been an ongoing commitment by the BOCC to the recycling goals as they have been set out for the county. It is clear that if we cut back on the recycling program we are not going to reach those goals. Regardless of what the manager might recommend with regard to the recycling program I don't see the County Commissioners accepting that cut in that area. I can only speak for myself.

Tipton states that doesn't the not filling or hiring the operations manager for recycling already makes a statement?

Yuhasz states that I don't know so I can't speak to how much of that particular position is completely funded by the 3-R Fee. There may need to be a distinction made in hiring that position and hiring other positions.

Tipton states that that position manages the 3-R Fee. That position is responsible for bringing in the money. I can't get my head around what this says to the recycling program for the county. That is the management position for the recycling program for the County.

Yuhasz states that I don't know how any of the positions are specifically funded. If in fact that position is funded out of the 3-R Fee and not funded through the County general fund then there is an argument to be made that it should be filled regardless of hiring freezes in other positions.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Wilson states that the 3-R Fee is part of the enterprise fund. All the positions in the recycling division are funded through the 3-R Fee. That is the way it was established and that was its intent.

Pollock states that if you [Steve] were to look at the 3-R Fee in segments – the basic fee, curbside and so on if you added up all the cost of those and then incorporated a piece of the administration of those then the answer is yes it is funded exclusively from that without a measurable general fund contribution.

Yuhasz states that then an argument can be made that that position should be filled.

Sassaman states that it seems to me to be a critical position.

Guild asks has anyone said that it won't be.

Ward asks Steve is that a case that you would find yourself making to the County manager.

Yuhasz states that I will inquire of the County manager why this particular decision is being in this way. I think I can communicate that there was concern by the SWAB about that position being lost.

Ward states that let's assume that that is the case and a strong argument for filling that position and that position is filled then what keeps from implementing these two programs?

Wilson states that when we've recruited a competent person and they have stepped in it could happen almost immediately.

Ward moves that the SWAB communicate with the BOCC that if it determined that the 3-R Fee is the funding source for the current vacant recycling manager position and it translates to that position being filled that the recycling programs for lights containing mercury and cooking oil be implemented as soon as practical after that position is filled.

Guild 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Vote passes unanimously.

#### **4. Fiscal 2010-11 Solid Waste Management Budget Issues**

*Private vs Public County Buildings/Schools/SWCCS Waste Collection* Wilson states that budget times are tough and there will be significant changes this year. Everything thing is potentially on the table. I've been asked to conduct an evaluation to

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

determine if private companies can provide the solid waste convenience center and sanitation related hauling services at a cheaper rate. I have received some of the information I need and am analyzing it. I will be sharing that with the manger on Monday. He will proceed to recommend to the Board what he thinks is best. Tipton asks for clarification-- you are comparing getting roll-off and front load service for trash and recycling collection from the convenience centers. So basically you are comparing what an outside company can do it for and what you all do it for and deciding what to do from there.

Wilson replies recycling is not included. The manager has asked that we compare the hauling cost that we provide not only for the non-recycling hauling cost from the convenience centers providing waste collection service from county government buildings and for county schools. Providing him with the information based on our analysis as to their relative costs and assuming whether there are cost savings to be incurred by doing something different than what we are doing now.

As Steve alluded to earlier he is not taking a narrow view but a broad view in looking at all the interconnectedness. There may be savings in one area but there could be some consequence in another area that it actually increases costs. I think it is his intention to try to look as globally and holistically as possible at the costs and make recommendations accordingly. It is my job to provide him with the best information so that he can make informed decisions and recommendations.

Sassaman asks how many trucks do you use for this.

Wilson replies two roll-off trucks and three front loaders. What makes the analysis a little trickier is the drivers also cover the attendants at the sites for lunch, they haul stone as needed and do other maintenance services. The approach would have to change and develop a new service culture around the convenience centers if private haulers were used.

Tipton asks what would happen to the equipment you have now.

Wilson replies if recycling had a need for them I would assume they would have first choice. I presume if they were surplus they would be treated as such and put on GovDeals.

Sassaman states that a couple of years ago when we were talking about outside services we talked about living wage. I don't recall where we ended up with that but would we expect the private haulers that now work within the County to pay a living wage.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Wilson states that I don't know if there is a consistent county policy that requires all contractors and/or sub-contractors in any service or construction to pay a minimum living wage. Most of the larger haulers would pay close to a living wage.

Ward asks if that is part of the analysis.

Wilson states that we are not going out for bid. I am assembling nonbinding, informal budget estimates from companies. I did not ask them about a living wage.

Yuhasz states that it would be worthwhile to ask that question.

Spire states that it may be important to note that the trucks costs \$270,00 or more so a person off the street would not be hired to operate this vehicle.

Yuhasz states that it may not be just the drivers that these companies hire. There are people that do other tasks.

Wilson states that company wide they may have some minimum wage employees.

Yuhasz states that that is part of the equation.

Wilson states that that wasn't part of our inquiring the data but it can be listed as a key issue in the summary presented to the manager.

Bowerman asks in this do you also say “If you go with this we will no longer need this many workers in our group. “ Is that part of the analysis?

Wilson states that are you asking does it list the existing employees that might lose their job. No, at this preliminary information gathering it probably wouldn't be appropriate. If business is down for them, they may have people they want to call back too. If we went forward to a bid process and if this was going to be privatized there are six positions and it could be put in the bid some how to hire those employees.

Pollock asks if they do go out for bid, did they indicate if the bid package would be structured so that we as a public agency could bid. Charlotte had that with their garbage collection.

Wilson states that there has been no discussion with the manager about the bidding and what a bid package might look like because we haven't gotten that far yet.

Ward asks if the quality of service is part of what the County manager is interested in or is it bottom line.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Wilson states that not speaking for the manager, our discussions have focused on bottom line.

Ward asks do you feel comfortable that the bottom line opportunities that you are bringing to him compared to the county service are apples to apples with regard to quality of service.

Wilson states that I would expect there to be a less quality of service.

Ward states that that should be communicated and understood by the Board.

Wilson states that that is one of the key issues in the presentation. It is going to list the costs from the private service, the cost for us to do it and list of other things to take into consideration.

b. *Solid Waste Convenience Center Operations Funding Source* Wilson states that that carries over from some of the prior discussion of the work group. If the Board has any input or advise I don't know if there will be any further reductions in convenience centers services, programs, hours, or days. I don't expect any increase. It all boils down to costs. If the SWAB or the Work Group has any input on that issue how to fund them or how to supplement funding I'm sure the Board and/or the manager will be glad to hear it.

Sassaman asks if there will be an opportunity to put it before the decision is made.

Wilson states that the decision will be made by the BOCC so there will be opportunity to provide input to the BOCC. I don't know if there will be opportunity before the manger makes his recommendation.

Ward asks Steve to give a rough outline of what the budget timeline is.

Yuhasz states that the manager should present a budget the first week of May to the BOCC. We are already in budget discussions. There was a budget workshop last Thursday in which he laid out the bottom line of what we are looking at. This current fiscal year budget is \$177+ million. The projected revenue for next year is \$174 million. We are looking at a \$3+ million reduction in county spending next year over this year. That is \$3.5 million that we have to find somewhere. The way we're finding it and the way manager has asked to take all the departments and tell them you have to spend less money tell me where you can spend less money.

Ward asks has the BOCC asked the County manager to come back with a 'no tax increase' budget.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Yuhasz states that it is a clear indication from the BOCC that there will be no tax increase. The problem with increasing spending in any program you start from a position that the school system has unlimited demands. There is an expectation that the BOCC are going to fund the school system at 50% of the overall budget roughly traditionally is what it has been. So for every dollar spent in some program that is not the school system \$2 needs to be raised.

Pollock asks if that is an ordinance or a policy.

Yuhasz replies a policy. It is a hard fought and barely won to keep it down to 50%.

Wilson states that a solid waste budget submitted a month ago was a half million dollars less than current year's budget. The manager after doing additional analysis and gets additional information and says he wants another 15% of the remaining budget which comes to \$1.6 million for Solid Waste budget. If he maintains that position, \$1.6 million there will be programs cut.

Yuhasz states that he has asked all the departments to come back with a 15% reduction. Not all the programs suggested will be cut. We don't need a 15% reduction we need a 3-4% reduction in the overall budget.

Guild states that the budget you submitted was already down by 5%.

Wilson states that the budget presented was roughly 5% less than last year and then due to changing circumstances he asked for more. As of now of the 1.6 million I'm up to about 900,000 and I am meeting with him on Monday bringing an array of cuts and programs for him to choose what he wants. A lot of the cuts will come from positions either vacant or not vacant.

Pollock states that that was irrespective of funding sources.

Wilson states that he did not get into detail about the funding sources. As Steve was talking about earlier, half of all the money goes to the schools and half of the other half is personnel. You can't make too many savings without cutting personnel. Twenty-one vacant positions have already been cut this Spring.

Yuhasz states that as citizens of Orange County we all need to learn to expect less in the way of service.

Bowerman asks is that we are aiming for.

Yuhasz states that it is not what we are aiming for it is what we will have to live with.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Bowerman asks is that the intention or do you intend to make it better ever.

Yuhasz states that we would like to look at this as a temporary setback that in the long haul the economy will improve, our ability to raise money from means other than the residential property tax will be enhanced. We need to look at other revenue sources other than property tax. Orange County has existed and maintained the level of service that it has maintained over the last 25 years by raising taxes every year. I think that the feeling is of many people that we can't do that any more. We can not just assume that every year we are going to raise the property tax to increase or maintain the level of services. We need to figure out a different way to do it. We have to figure out a different way of doing it now particularly because of the economy but the economy makes it more difficult. That is what we are facing and that is why we have these budget situations that we are at right now.

Ward states that the \$3.5 million gap of \$174 million so that is 2% that makes up that gap why is the manager asking Gayle (and everyone) to come up with 15% or 20% reductions. He's asking everyone to do it. That in itself is an awful thing to do to people. It's a huge amount of work and it's overkill.

Yuhasz states that I think he is trying to come up with a menu of opportunities for reductions. The opportunities to reduce spending in Social Services are very limited. The people who need social services help need social services help now more than they do any other time. So the pressure to maintain services in certain areas where people are least fortunate need the most help is very strong. You can tell everybody to cut 15% but frankly you are probably not going to cut anything out of social services or health department so you have to make up those differences somewhere. Hopefully no one will be cut 15% but some departments may need to be cut 10% in order to leave another department unchanged.

I haven't talked to the manager specifically about what his budget philosophy is and I won't know until he brings a budget back to us what his plan is. But I think that he has heard the strong message from the BOCC that this is going to be a no tax increase budget. There are some things we need to do that we haven't done in the past. We need to make an investment in the County's future. We need to spend more money on things that will bring us money – economic development things. There will be increases in funding in areas that on the face may not make sense to say we are going to spend \$300,000 on the Efland sewer when we don't need to do that right now but that is the kind of thing we need to do to put the County in a position when the economy does improve we will be able to take advantage of that.

Wilson states that what the manager has conveyed to staff is that the \$3-4 million shortfall is actually is now anticipated to be more. EMS has significant needs and the

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

school system has asked for another \$1.5 – 2 million and there has been new information on sales tax reimbursements. I think the problem went from pretty bad to worse.

Yuhasz states that I said \$3.5 million the difference that we were presented with the other day when you add up all the additional requests EMS needs two more ambulances and staff to man them, the schools need more, the shortfall is \$13.5 million. The critical number we have to remember here when it comes to looking at the budget is the projected revenues are only \$174 million. We don't see any place to change that.

Sassaman asks what do we need to further understand at this point to do anything.

Wilson states that I hope you understand as much as you can understand. What you can do, I am not sure.

Pollock states that one thing apropos about the thing about Social Services our internal email came across the four vacant positions were internally advertised to be filled so that is an indicator of that pressing need. They will continue to try to fill the pressing need. In terms of the notion that Steve just brought up, a critical point the way the recycling markets have been functioning and our ability to play them this has been an unexpectedly good time for recycling to have made some money and part of that was a consequence of having a person that was adept in playing the market in this micro level. Our ability to make money for the county has been good.

Because I just finally finished up the 40 pages of Work Group meeting record from December you all did discuss what are the other options for SWCC funding sources. One of the things brought up at the meeting if we are going to do anything we have to actually show some improvements. We can't just take a dollar from taxes and fund it with a dollar from the fee but if the convenience centers for example as we go forward and we'll have to go to Durham with stuff we have to be more efficient how do we invest in the convenience centers. The fire and smoke from the current budget issue does kind of detract from our ability to look at how to invest in that. Maybe this isn't the time to visit those particulars of the funding sources but that is something that the SWAB or Work Group may want to visit again before the budget cycle is over so that we don't get caught going to Durham one ton at a time.

Wilson states that the BOCC has specifically asked that we come back with some hard numbers on the convenience center development options in particular the neighborhood district model, but again with less staff to do analysis and it's probably not a good time to say "We can do this at the convenience centers for only a million dollars." Even if it does give us efficiency. We are just going to have to make do. Each department feels passionate about what they do and it is painful to have to

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

dismantle what you have spent years doing and it is also tough to see potential reduction in force where people you've worked with for many years and you know they have a family and a mortgage and they have to look for a job.

Sassaman states that I understand what you are saying and maybe I'm looking at this too simplistically but my understanding is the purpose of the enterprise fund was to protect certain services from the vicissitudes of the general fund and the tax implications and to have certain things have that base. Having said that I think it is important to have the manager and the commissioners understand that the Towns, Chapel Hill at least, we expect those things that are to be protected by the enterprise fund and the 3-R Fee to be protected. That was the purpose behind the interlocal agreement and the establishment of the enterprise fund.

Vickers states that the only problem with the enterprise fund is when it was established it was clean. There was resistance to having Public Works moving into the department because then there were non-funded public enterprise activities within the public enterprise. You are mixing tax money and the enterprise fund.

Wilson states that there is no mixing it is just different rules to play by. Positions are not split but we integrated the department as much as possible because it makes it efficient but it also makes it difficult when you try to pull something out that may have tentacles to something else.

- 5. Future SWAB/Interlocal Agreement** Wilson states that this was put on the agenda to get you all to thinking. Each individual [government] participant of the interlocal agreement due to the decision on the transfer station is now going through the process of reevaluation of the relationship with each other and the County. Where do we go from here? Do we modify the interlocal agreement and stay together in some formal way in hauling to Durham and seeking some more permanent perhaps technological means of handling and dealing with our waste in the future? Do we say we've had a good run and now it is time for each to go their way? Included in that do we dissolve the SWAB? If so does another entity created to provide a forum for discussion and debate of solid waste issues and a place for the public to come and participate? Does the SWAB continue in some modified role similar to what it is now? If the SWAB has any input or advice or recommendations in that regard now would be a useful time to provide to all the jurisdictions.

Sassaman states that absent all of us having a copy of the interlocal agreement in front of us I think there are a couple of things that we could do to begin this discussion and then carry it on to the next meeting. First of all we could ask Steve to give us consensus or his interpretation of the Commissioners whether this board is serving what they think it ought to be serving. And then Jim I would ask you the same question with regard to the Town Council in as much as you can answer it. Then ask

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

the same thing from those that are present as what we see as this board contributing in the past and in the future.

Yuhasz states that the first thing we have to do is recognize that the interlocal agreement was designed for an organization that was going to operate a landfill. Everything that we see in that it was really structured for that purpose. Given that there were different jurisdictions that had a part in that we want to make sure that there was regular input from each of those jurisdictions on how the solid waste operation should run. The question that has come up is with the decision to close the landfill to not build a transfer station but send the garbage to Durham what is it now that the interlocal agreement suppose to manage and what kind of advice if any does the BOCC as the primary member of the interlocal agreement should it expect. I don't know that we have had any discussion about that. But that frames the question that we will be looking at. Whether or not this board should continue to exist depends on how we are going to be looking at the interlocal agreement going forward and whether not that interlocal agreement continue in the form that it is in. Should it be revised in some way?

My feeling is there should be some continuing consolidated recycling effort. Whether or not the other solid waste goes on as a consolidated effort depend a large part what our partners decide. The discussion needs to be among the partners as to how they see the interlocal agreement continuing or not continuing before we can really talk about if the SWAB needs to continue.

Ward states that at this point my only thought is that it's a decision all the partners need to be a part of and it not a County decision. It came up in the newspaper or something the County manager had said that as the County was looking at all the various boards that they were going to be scrutinized as worth spending staff time on or not. It raised some concern. This wasn't a County board it was created by multiple governments. I want to make sure that it is a decision that benefits from the conversation from all the members.

I would anticipate that there would be continued value in having a forum to discuss issues as solid waste or recycling. It can be done a lot better if we are acting as one than acting separately.

Vickers states that the interlocal agreement really dealt with solid waste disposal and recycling. The transfer station issue brings into question whether we have a county-wide waste disposal. We still have a county-wide recycling effort. The real issue is going to be do we maintain the same board to focus on that. Whatever comes out of the solid waste decision between the political entities is going to be up in the air for a year or two. But there is still a role on the recycling that should continue.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Pollock states that that is basically true there are some material cooperative efforts. For example the Towns of Hillsborough and Carrboro distribute recycling bins to their citizens and routinely publicize any kind of program changes that we do. There are subtle operational things that we do that, while the County does run it, we get a lot of cooperation with the Towns. The material benefit of reduced tipping fees against flat recycling costs is always there. The more stuff that gets put in the blue bin the better off the Town is. As long as we have that structure it's in their interest.

Bowerman states that in regard to the interlocal agreement I would suspect that they are going to change how they look at things but it seems that it would be a bad idea to minimize citizen input. We may not be the best way to do that, but we must keep citizen input.

Sassaman states that the interlocal agreement deals with two issues. It specifies that the County is responsible for providing disposal for solid waste and recycling and the Towns are responsible for collecting and gathering the solid waste and delivering it to the County facility in its simplest form. No matter how we do things whether we have a landfill, a waste transfer station, a high tech plasma torch or we nuke it those things remain. To have that work together you have to have some kind of agreement. Even if we revise the agreement those things are sacrosanct. The interlocal agreement calls for this body. As Al knows we struggled with our identity and trying to obtain the respect of the Commissioners, and in some cases the councils we represent. In some ways we have changed a lot of what we do and how we do it. We went for eight years and never saw a citizen until Bonnie came. We have a regular presence of a Commissioners in our midst now. We've been asked to do things like having Gershman here and entertained his report. We've been told to continue to look at alternative technologies. There is a lot more to be said and looked at than just Georgia Tech's view on plasma torch. We do have a role but I think our role has changed a lot and it may change some more.

Those are the things we need to be looking at and thinking about at the next meetings.

Pollock states that it is a little bit chicken and egg with the thing Jim mentioned. Who has the ball next? Do the Boards give direction about the SWAB or does the SWAB reporting back to the respective Boards about this discussion. Based on this discussion we usually just give you all the minutes maybe we could give you some memo that frames this as something the SWAB members can take back to their boards to help solidify this.

Wilson states that without more input from the SWAB and more specificity we are sort of flailing on our own. I am unsure what the County manager's preferences are or what his conversations with individual Board members are so I am not sure that

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

this is the best thing as being staff-initiated. It is important but a very political thing. Solid waste will be a continuing issues for generations, it just the way it is.

Yuhasz states that one question that has to be looked at is how do we fund this. There aren't any more tipping fees; the enterprise fund is not going to grow going forward and those resources are going to have to be carefully guarded for the expense of closing the landfill. I think part of what has to happen with the interlocal agreement is how this is going to be funded. Without a commitment to fund in some real way the efforts of the SWAB and the interlocal agreement we aren't going to have anything to do with.

The County Commissioners to the extent that we will be discussing all the advisory boards and commissions that next discussion will happen on June 10<sup>th</sup>. We have invited and welcomed recommendations from each of the advisory boards as to what the boards think their role is currently and what they think it should be going forward.

Sassaman states that we should try to get some input from our Towns by then.

Bonnie has some things she'd like to say.

Hauser states that on the budget discussion on the 3-R Fee that covers all the recycling programs, do you allocate a portion of the overhead meaning the building and management salaries?

Wilson replies that the 3-R Fee does cover a portion of the overhead and facilities.

Hauser states it really is fully funding all the costs. That on the interlocal agreement and I agree with Steve's point that it was great to manage a landfill and in the last year we watched it be used, intentionally or not, to site a facility outside of the Towns. So it was unfortunately used by the Towns to not take responsibility for a location for the trash and the problem was dumped on the county. Whatever we do going forward I would hope that the Towns would say "We are going to participate in this decision, it is our garbage too. " The second thing is after the Durham short-term thing we have a much bigger strategic issue than this board. We've talked about possible regional solutions, we have disposables other than solid waste and recycling – we have sewage sludge, hospital waste lots of other disposals in this county that we are not dealing with. So is there a way for this board in its future form be construed or constructed to deal with more strategic issues. I don't really believe that Gayle and Blair need a board to tell them how to do their jobs, they are good at it. I don't think we need board aligned with a department in the county. Let's use the board more strategically

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Wilson states that economies of scale have pretty much always been important. Moving forward to the future with any kind of technological opportunity economy of scale will be more important, particularly if you move waste longer distances. That would tend to imply that there are advantages in working together into the future. Most counties have some type of solid waste advisory board. I would expect that if the SWAB ended tomorrow that something would rise in its place to provide that mechanism for discussion.

Jan there has been citizens here before depending on the topic.

The interlocal agreement did anticipate a waste transfer station. We new that the landfill was going to close at some point and the interlocal agreement was crafted essentially to give the county the responsibility of dealing with what came next. It has worked well from the Landfill Owners Group which transitioned into County management with an advisory board. There will be an end to the MSW landfill but there will continue to be a C&D landfill and other operations that will generate fees but not at the level we are accustomed to. From the staff point there is some advantage to maintaining some formal relationship into the future. We don't know what is in our future but we have to have some means to pursue it, discuss it and dissect it.

Yuhasz states that the SWAB has been important and I think the Commissioners have appreciated it even though we might not have followed the advice that came from the SWAB. As we move forward where we will have opportunities for technical changes we will need some board who will look at all those different technical opportunities and advise the Commissioners if in fact the Commissioners are the ones who will have to make those decisions. I see a continuing role for the SWAB.

**6. Programs/Services Update**

a. *Dr. Cercio – April Plasma Torch Technology Presentation* Pollock states that the presentation was highly effective and well attended. The power point and the video are on the web page. Obviously from the handout from the manager there is interest in another technology -- anaerobic digestion. We also have information from another company on anaerobic digestion ... if the board wants to pursue a similar path on that or other technologies. I have also been in dialog with a group that has promoting zero waste through composting, recycling and that may be something the board wishes to consider next time. Do you want consider other technologies?

b. *Waste Composition Study* – Pollock states that it is going on right now. We are in our fifth and last cycle of picking through 50 loads of garbage, sorting it into 45 categories and weighing it. Seeing how we compare to previous years. Being on the landfill face almost everyday I've noticed that there is almost no cardboard left in the garbage and the amount of newspapers and magazines is minuscule. When we get

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

the report back in a month we will have some good data for you to compare against what's on the web right now.

c. *Rigid Plastics Recycling Program* Pollock states that plastics are improving. With another month of intensive education on site and the barricade signs we've gotten to about 50% of the material coming in from the unstaffed sites is good now.

Wilson states that more resources would be devoted to separating it out.

Marshall states that containers are also getting construction debris and garbage.

Wilson states that if it doesn't improve we cannot continue it at the unstaffed sites. There is a limit to how much of people's garbage we can take.

Marshall states that it's definitely much better.

Wilson states that this is an example of a new program that should not have taken much staff time but is taking unanticipated time.

Pollock states that there has never been a problem at the unstaffed sites of this magnitude. The boxes have sat there before, they are just a different color.

d. *Other* Wilson states that a couple of handouts have been passed out read them at your leisure.

Marshall states that to respond to Commissioner Yuhasz's earlier question about the minimum amount of light bulb tonnage needed in order to get the pricing. That is 2,000 lb minimum to get the pricing.

Yuhasz asks how much are we getting now.

Marshall replies over a course of a year we've generated more than the 2,000 but it is the matter of the having the ability to store it for a long period of time.

7. **Board Member Comments** Bowerman states that I hear from people that they miss the old hours at the convenience centers.

8. **Other Business**

Vickers moves to adjourn.

Guild 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Minutes - Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
April 14, 2010  
**Approved May 12, 2010**

Adjourn: 9:15 pm

Next meeting: May 12, 2010